EXHIBIT 6

```
P1MsAUT1
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2
 3
     AUTHORS GUILD, et al.,
 4
                    Plaintiffs,
5
                                             23 Civ. 8292 (SHS) (OTW)
                v.
 6
     OPENAI, INC., et al.,
                                             Conference
7
                    Defendants.
8
 9
     JULIAN SANCTON, et al.,
10
                    Plaintiffs,
11
                                            23 Civ. 10211 (SHS) (OTW)
                v.
12
13
     OPENAI, INC., et al.,
                    Defendants.
14
15
16
     THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY,
17
                   Plaintiff,
18
                v.
                                            23 Civ. 11195 (SHS) (OTW)
19
     MICROSOFT CORPORATION, et al.,
20
                    Defendants.
21
     ----x
22
23
24
25
```

```
P1MsAUT1
      -----x
1
 2
     NICHOLAS A. BASBANES, et al.,
 3
                    Plaintiffs,
                                            24 Civ. 00084 (SHS) (OTW)
 4
                V.
 5
     MICROSOFT CORPORATION, et al.,
 6
                    Defendants.
7
 8
 9
10
                               APPEARANCES
11
     SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
12
           Interim Class Counsel for Authors Guild and Alter Class
     Actions
13
     BY: ROHIT NATH
14
     SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
          Attorneys for The New York Times
15
     BY: KATHERINE PEASLEE
          ZACH SAVAGE
16
          ALEXANDER P. FRAWLEY
          ADNAN MUTTALIB
17
          IAN CROSBY
          DEMETRI BLAISDELL
18
     ROTHWELL FIGG
19
          Attorneys for New York Times and Daily News
     BY: JENNIFER MAISEL
20
          STEVEN LIEBERMAN
          JENNY COLGATE
21
     LOEVY & LOEVY
22
          Attorneys for Center for Investigative Reporting
     BY: MATTHEW TOPIC
23
     LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
2.4
          Attorneys for Authors Guild and Alter Class Plaintiffs
     BY: RACHEL GEMAN
25
```

P1MsAUT1

fact that they are only requesting these custodians for a limited number of search terms. That is good. We appreciate that. But it overlooks the cost associated with adding a custodian in the first place.

In order to make somebody a custodian, The Times has to go collect all of their documents. Even to run search terms to get hit counts, The Times has to do that because, unfortunately, The Times is not available or able, due to the software that it uses, to run search terms in the native environment. We have to actually go collect all of those, deliver them to the document vendor, and have them do it. We have looked into switching that software, and, unfortunately, cannot do so on a timeline that is useful to this litigation. But we did see if that was an option.

And that process of collecting all of someone's documents is not just e-mail, although that is a big piece. There is e-mail/shared drives, personal drives, scanning the mobile device, scanning their hard drive, photocopying their hard copy documents, if they have those. All of that is part of that collection process.

And I reached out to our vendor to ask, what is the estimated cost per person just to complete on your end that collection, processing, loading, staging of data, to run search terms. And the answer I got was about \$46,000 per person.

(Continued on next page)